RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 2 1 2006

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed July 7, 2006. Claims 16-23, 34, and 35 are currently pending. By this response, Applicants have amended claims 16 and 34.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following discussion, Applicants believe that all of the claims are allowable. It is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response including amendments.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 16 – 23 and 34 – 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gordon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,335, hereinafter "Gordon"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As taught in Applicants' claim 16, a navigation command is initiated from a remote control. The navigation command is associated with a selected object in a first frame and includes a requested direction. The requested direction is in a direction from the selected object toward a <u>second object adjacent to the selected object</u>. The selected object may be located at the edge of a server-side image map object, where the server-side image map includes a plurality of navigable objects within a larger navigable object. As taught in Applicants' claim 16, when the selected object is located at an edge of a server-side image map object, in order to navigate from the selected object to the second object, at least one additional navigation command (in the requested direction) is required in order to navigate from the selected object, out of the server-side image map object, to the adjacent second object.

By contrast, Gordon fails to teach or suggest determining whether a selected object is located at an edge of a server-side image map object in the requested direction, and, when the selected object is located at an edge of a server-side image

482749-1

map object in the requested direction, receiving at least one additional navigation command in the requested direction to navigate from the selected object, out of the server-side image map object, to a second object adjacent to the selected object.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Gordon discloses receiving at least one additional navigation command in the requested direction to get over a speed bump, i.e., to navigate out of a server-side image map object. Specifically, the Examiner, referring to Figure 10 of Gordon, asserts that when a user wishes to navigate from the "Movies A-Z" menu item to the "New Releases" menu item, the user must use two navigation commands, i.e., a first navigation command to move from the "Movies A – Z" menu item to the "Movie Types" menu item and an additional navigation command to move from the "Movie Types" menu item to the "New Releases" menu item. (Office Action, Pg. 5). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the teachings of Gordon do not meet the claimed limitations of Applicants' claim 16.

Applicants' claim 16 states that a determination is made as to whether the selected object is located <u>at an edge of a server-side image map object</u> in the requested direction. Applicants' claim 16 further states that <u>when the selected object is located at an edge of a server-side image map object</u> in the requested direction, at least one additional navigation command is received, where the at least one additional navigation command is in the requested direction and enables navigation out of the server-side image map object. Since the Examiner interprets the quadrant including "Movies A-Z" and "Movie Types" as a server-side image map object, and indicates that "Movies A-Z" is the selected object and that the requested direction is clockwise from "Movies A-Z" toward "New Releases", then the "Movies A-Z" simply does not meet the limitations of Applicants' invention of claim 16. Namely, "Movies A-Z" is not located at the edge of a server-side image map object <u>in the requested direction</u>. Thus, because "Movies A-Z" does not teach Applicants' limitation that the additional navigation command is received when the selected object is <u>located at the edge of a server-side image map object in the requested direction</u>, the Examiner's assertion that the two navigation commands required to navigate from "Movies A-Z" to "New Releases" teach Applicants' navigation command and additional navigation command is incorrect.

482749-1

7

Furthermore, Gordon is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of any additional navigation command being received in order to navigate from a selected object to a second object adjacent to the selected object when the selected object is located at an edge of a server-side image map object in the requested direction of navigation, as taught in Applicants' invention of claim 16. As such, Gordon fails to teach each and every element of Applicants' invention of claim 16, as arranged in the claim.

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim" (Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added). The Gordon reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in the claim.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claim 16 is not anticipated by Gordon. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 16 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102. Furthermore, independent claim 34 recited features similar to the features of independent claim 16. Thus, for at least the same reasons discussed herein with respect to claim 16, Applicants submit that independent claim 34 is also not anticipated by Gordon and, therefore is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Furthermore, dependent claims 17 – 23 and 35 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 16 and 34, and recite additional limitations thereof. As such, and for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 16, Applicants submit that these dependent claims also are not anticipated by Gordon and are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

482749-1

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and passage of the claims to allowance. If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 21 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/21/06

Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808

482749-1